arXiv:1608.04206v1 [math.NT] 15 Aug 2016

QUASI-EQUIVALENCE OF HEIGHTS AND RUNGE'S THEOREM

P. HABEGGER

Abstract. Let P be a polynomial that depends on two variables X and Y and has algebraic coefficients. If x and y are algebraic numbers with $P(x,y)=0$, then by work of Néron $h(x)/q$ is asymptotically equal to $h(y)/p$ where p and q are the partial degrees of P in X and Y, respectively. In this paper we compute a completely explicit bound for $|h(x)/q-h(y)/p|$ in terms of P which grows asymptotically as $\max\{h(x),h(y)\}^{1/2}$. We apply this bound to obtain a simple version of Runge's Theorem on the integral solutions of certain polynomial equations.

1. Introduction

Suppose P is an irreducible polynomial in two variables X and Y and whose coefficients are in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, an algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q}$. If x and y are algebraic numbers with $P(x,y)=0$ we investigate the relation between the absolute logarithmic Weil heights $h(x)$ and $h(y)$; this height is defined in Section 2.

Say $p=\deg_X P\geq 1$ and $q=\deg_Y P\geq 1$. By work of Néron [11] there exists a constant $c(P)$ such that if x and y are algebraic numbers with $P(x,y)=0$, then

$$\left|\frac{h(x)}{q}-\frac{h(y)}{p}\right|\leq c(P)\max\left\{\frac{h(x)}{q},\frac{h(y)}{p}\right\}^{1/2}. \tag{1}$$

See Corollary 9.3.10 in Bombieri and Gubler's book [5] or Theorem B.5.9 in Hindry and Silverman's book [9] for a highbrow approach to this bound. One sometimes says that $h(x)/q$ and $h(y)/p$ are quasi-equivalent.

Our aim is to determine an admissible constant $c(P)$ which is completely explicit in terms of P. We will strive for a good dependency in the projective height $h_p(P)$ of P, which we also define in Section 2, and the partial degrees p and q.

Theorem 1. *Let $P\in\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ be irreducible with $p=\deg_X P\geq 1$ and $q=\deg_Y P\geq 1$. If $P(x,y)=0$ with $x,y\in\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, then (1) holds with*

$$c(P)=5\left(\log\left(2^{\min\{p,q\}}(p+1)(q+1)\right)+h_p(P)\right)^{1/2}.$$

Abouzaid [1] proved a related height estimate. In his bound, the dependence on the partial degrees and the numerical constants are slightly worse. Quasi-equivalence of heights also follows from Bartolome's Theorem 1.3 [2], but again with larger numerical constants and worse dependency on p and q.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 11G50, secondary: 11D41, 11G30, 14H25, 14H50.

Key words and phrases. Heights, Absolute Siegel Lemma, Runge's Theorem.

It is essential that P is irreducible. For example both partial degrees of $(X^2 - Y)(X - Y^2)$ equal 3. But (1) cannot hold for this polynomial as $h(x^2) = 2h(x)$ for all algebraic x. It is possible to formulate a version of Theorem 1 when $K \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a number field and if $P \in K[X, Y]$ is irreducible. In this case P is up to a scalar factor the product of polynomials which are irreducible in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X, Y]$ and conjugated over K. Thus all factors have equal partial degrees.

Sometimes it is useful to bound $h(y)$ uniformly in terms of $h(x)$ if the height of x is large. We do this in the following corollary.

Corollary 2. *Let P, p, and q be as in Theorem 1. If $P(x, y) = 0$ with $x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and*

$$\max\left\{\frac{h(x)}{q}, \frac{h(y)}{p}\right\} \geq 100\left(\log\left(2^{\min\{p,q\}}(p+1)(q+1)\right) + h_p(P)\right) \tag{2}$$

then $h(y) \leq 2\frac{p}{q}h(x)$.

The proof of Theorem 1 depends on the theory of functions fields and on the Absolute Siegel Lemma by Zhang [17]. Roy and Thunder's [12, 13] absolute Siegel Lemma would also suffice but would lead to different numerical constants. Using Bombieri and Vaaler's classical version of Siegel's Lemma instead would come at the cost of introducing a dependency in $c(P)$ on a number field containing the coefficients of P.

We give a short sketch of the proof of Theorem 1. Let m and n be large integers such that n/m is approximately equal to p/q. In Section 2 we use the Absolute Siegel Lemma to construct polynomials A and B in X and Y with algebraic coefficients of bounded height, not both zero, such that P divides $AY^m - B$ as a polynomial. By choosing the parameters appropriately, we can arrange that $P \nmid A$. Say $P(x, y) = 0$, then $A(x, y)y^m = B(x, y)$. If we assume for the moment $A(x, y) \neq 0$, then we may bound the height of y in terms of the height of x by using the product formula. In Section 3 we show that a suitable vanishing order cannot be too large. We then apply an appropriate differential operator and replace A, B by new polynomials A', B' with controlled projective height and degree such that $A'(x, y)y^m = B'(x, y)$ and $A'(x, y) \neq 0$. Thus again we get a bound for $h(y)$ in terms of $h(x)$. By swapping x and y we get an estimate in the other direction and this completes the proof if (x, y) is not singular point on the vanishing locus of P. Singular points can be handled directly. A novel aspect of our approach is that it does not depend on Eisenstein's Theorem which bounds the coefficients of a power series of an algebraic function. An explicit version of Eisenstein's Theorem was used in the work of Abouzaid and Bartolome.

Runge [14] proved that $P(x, y) = 0$ admits only finitely many solutions $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ if $P \in \mathbb{Q}[X, Y]$ is irreducible with $\deg_X P = \deg_Y P = \deg P$ and if the homogeneous part of P of maximal degree is not a rational multiple of the power of an irreducible polynomial in $\mathbb{Q}[X, Y]$. Runge's method is effective and explicit upper bounds for $\max\{|x|, |y|\}$ were obtained for example by Hilliker-Straus [8] and Walsh [15, 16]. They rely on Eisenstein's Theorem.

We will prove a simple and explicit version of Runge's Theorem using Theorem 1.

Theorem 3. *Let $P \in \mathbb{Z}[X, Y]$ be irreducible in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X, Y]$ and assume $d = \deg_X P = \deg_Y P = \deg P$. Furthermore, assume that the homogeneous part of P of degree d*

is not a rational multiple of the power of an irreducible polynomial in $\mathbb{Q}[X,Y]$. *If* $P(x,y)=0$ *with* $x,y\in\mathbb{Z}$, *then*

$$\log\max\{1,|x|,|y|\}\leq 115d^4(\log(2d)+h_p(P)).$$

Walsh's [15, 16] result holds for a larger class of polynomials but our dependency on the degree is d^4 instead of his d^6.

It would be interesting to see if a more sophisticated version of Runge's Theorem, such as Bombieri's on page 304 [4], can be proved using our Theorem 1.

A variation of this paper appeared in the appendix of the author's 2007 Ph.D. thesis. He thanks his supervisor David Masser for support throughout those years. He is also grateful to Umberto Zannier for pointing out Zhang's version of the Absolute Siegel Lemma and to the referee for helpful comments and corrections.

2. Construction using the Absolute Siegel Lemma

We begin by setting up notation, our reference for heights is Chapter 1.5 in Bombieri and Gubler's book [5].

Let K be a number field. A place v of K is an absolute value $|\cdot|_v : K\to[0,\infty)$ such that either $|x|_v=\max\{x,-x\}$ for all $x\in\mathbb{Q}$ or $|\cdot|_v$ coincides with the p-adic absolute value on $\mathbb{Q}$ for a prime p and $|p|_v=1/p$. In the former case we call v infinite and in the latter we call it finite. If v is infinite, then $|x|_v=|\sigma(x)|$ for a ring homomorphism $\sigma:K\to\mathbb{C}$ that is uniquely determined up-to complex conjugation. We set $d_v=1$ if $\sigma(K)\subseteq\mathbb{R}$ and $d_v=2$ else wise. A finite place v is induced by a maximal ideal in the ring of integers of K. We set d_v to be the product of the ramification index and the residue degree attached to this prime ideal. We let M_K denote the set of all places of K.

The absolute logarithmic Weil height of $x\in K$ is

$$h(x)=\frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}\sum_{v\in M_K} d_v\log\max\{1,|x|_v\}. \tag{3}$$

It is well-defined and attains the same value at x when evaluated using any number field $F\supseteq K$.

For $a\in K^N$ we define $|a|_v$ to be the maximum of the absolute values of the coordinates of a with respect to v. If P is a polynomial in any number of variables with coefficients in K, then $|P|_v$ denotes the maximum of the absolute values of the coefficients of P with respect to v. The projective height of $a\neq 0$ is

$$h_p(a)=\frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}\sum_{v\in M_K} d_v\log|a|_v. \tag{4}$$

By the product formula, cf. Proposition 1.4.4 [5], $h_p(a)$ is invariant under replacing a by a non-zero scalar multiple of itself, so $h_p(a)\geq 0$. If P is a non-zero polynomial with algebraic coefficients we set $h_p(P)$ to be the projective height of the vector whose coordinates are the non-zero coefficients of P. If Q is a further polynomial with algebraic coefficients it will be useful to set $h_p(P,Q)=h_p(P+TQ)$ where T is an unknown that does not appear in P or Q.

For any place v of K and integer $n\geq 1$ it is convenient to define $\delta_v(n)=\max\{1,|n|_v\}$.

We start by proving a lemma concerning simple properties of places and heights. It corresponds to Lemma A.1 in the author's thesis, whose part (i) is incorrect.

Lemma 1. *Let K be a field and $A, B \in K[X,Y]$.*

(i) *If K is a number field and if $v \in M_K$, then*

$$|A+B|_v \le \delta_v(2)\max\{|A|_v, |B|_v\},$$
$$|AB|_v \le \delta_v((\min\{\deg_X A, \deg_X B\}+1)(\min\{\deg_Y A, \deg_Y B\}+1))|A|_v|B|_v.$$

(ii) *If $K = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $A(x,y) \neq 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} h(B(x,y)/A(x,y)) &\le h_p(A,B) + \max\{\deg_X A, \deg_X B\}h(x) \\ &\quad + \max\{\deg_Y A, \deg_Y B\}h(y) \\ &\quad + \log\max\{(\deg_X A+1)(\deg_Y A+1), (\deg_X B+1)(\deg_Y B+1)\} \end{aligned}$$

(iii) *Say $K = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $A(x,y) = 0$. If A is not divisible in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ by any $X - \alpha$ with $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, then*

$$h(y) \le h_p(A) + (\deg_X A)h(x) + \log((\deg_X A + 1)\deg_Y A). \tag{5}$$

Proof. The first inequality in (i) follows from the triangle inequality. To prove the second inequality we write $A = \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}X^iY^j$ and $B = \sum_{i,j} b_{ij}X^iY^j$. Then $AB = \sum_{i,j} c_{ij}X^iY^j$ with

$$c_{ij} = \sum_{\substack{i'+i''=i \\ j'+j''=j}} a_{i'j'}b_{i''j''}.$$

The sum above involves at most $(1+\min\{\deg_X A, \deg_X B\})(1+\min\{\deg_Y A, \deg_Y B\})$ non-zero terms. Hence the desired inequality follows from the triangle inequality.

Now we prove part (ii). The product formula implies

$$h(B(x,y)/A(x,y)) = \frac{1}{[F:\mathbb{Q}]}\sum_{v\in M_F} d_v \log\max\{|A(x,y)|_v, |B(x,y)|_v\} \tag{6}$$

where F is a number field containing x, y and the coefficients of A and B. Note that the polynomial A involves at most $(\deg_X A+1)(\deg_Y A+1)$ non-zero coefficients, hence the triangle inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} &|A(x,y)|_v \le \\ &\quad \delta_v((\deg_X A+1)(\deg_Y A+1))|A|_v \max\{1,|x|_v\}^{\deg_X A}\max\{1,|y|_v\}^{\deg_Y A} \end{aligned}$$

for each $v \in M_F$. Of course a similar inequality holds for $|B(x,y)|_v$. These inequalities inserted into (6) conclude this part of the lemma.

Our proof for Part (iii) follows the lines of Proposition 5 [3]. Say $A = a_qY^q + \cdots + a_0$ with $a_i \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X]$ and $a_q \neq 0$, so $q = \deg_Y A$. By hypothesis there exists a maximal $q' \ge 1$ such that $a_{q'}(x) \neq 0$. Let F be a number field that contains x, y, and the coefficients of A. If $v \in M_F$, then

$$|a_{q'}(x)y^{q'}|_v \le \delta_v(q')\max_{0\le k\le q'-1}\{|a_k(x)|_v\}\max\{1,|y|_v\}^{q'-1}$$

and so

$$\max\{1, |y|_v\} \leq \delta_v(q') \max_{0\leq k\leq q'} \{|a_k(x)|_v/|a_{q'}(x)|_v\}.$$

We use the last inequality, $q' \leq q$, the product formula, and (3) to deduce

$$h(y) \leq \log q + \frac{1}{[F:\mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{v\in M_F} d_v \log \max_{0\leq k\leq q} \{|a_k(x)|_v\}. \tag{7}$$

The triangle inequality implies

$$|a_k(x)|_v \leq \delta_v(\deg_X A + 1) \max\{1, |x|_v\}^{\deg_X A} |A|_v$$

for any $v \in M_F$. We apply this inequality to (7) to complete the proof. □

We will sometimes apply property (iii) of the previous lemma to a non-zero $A \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[Y]$ and $x = 0$. Inequality (5) then reduces to $h(y) \leq h_p(A) + \log(\deg_Y A)$.

We introduce a basic notion of a sparsity. If $\mathcal{A} = (a_{ij})$ is an $M \times N$ matrix, then we set

$$S(\mathcal{A}) = \max_{1\leq i\leq M} \#\{j : a_{ij} \neq 0\}.$$

If $\mathcal{A}$ has coefficients in a number field K and is non-zero we define $h_p(\mathcal{A})$ to be the projective height of $\mathcal{A}$ taken as an element of $K^{MN} \smallsetminus \{0\}$, as in (4).

Next we adapt Zhang's Absolute Siegel Lemma, as it was used by David and Philippon [7], to our notation. See also Bartolome's Section 2.4 [2].

Lemma 2. *Let $\mathcal{A} \in Mat_{MN}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$ have rank $M < N$. Then there exists $v \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^N \smallsetminus \{0\}$ such that $\mathcal{A}v = 0$ and*

$$h(v) \leq \frac{M}{N-M}\left(\frac{1}{2}\log S(\mathcal{A}) + h_p(\mathcal{A})\right) + \frac{\log(N-M)}{2}.$$

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$. We apply David and Philippon's Lemme 4.7 [7] by which there exists $v \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^N \smallsetminus \{0\}$ with $\mathcal{A}v = 0$ and

$$h(v) \leq \frac{1}{N-M} h(V) + \frac{1}{N-M} \sum_{i=1}^{N-M-1} \sum_{j=1}^{i} \frac{1}{2j} + \epsilon$$

where $V \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^N$ is the kernel of $\mathcal{A}$ and $h(V)$ is the logarithmic height of the vector space V as defined just before Lemme 4.7 [7]. We have $(N-M)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N-M-1} \sum_{j=1}^{i} (2j)^{-1} < 2^{-1} \log(N-M)$, so

$$h(v) \leq \frac{1}{N-M} h(V) + \frac{\log(N-M)}{2}. \tag{8}$$

if $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough. We note that the height used by David and Philippon uses the Euclidean norm at the infinite places. It is at least as large as $h(v)$ which uses the supremum norm at all places. By Corollary 2.8.12 [5] the height $h(V)$ is equals $h_{\mathrm{Ar}}(\mathcal{A}^t)$ as in Remark 2.8.7 *loc.cit.* where $\mathcal{A}^t$ is the transpose of $\mathcal{A}$. In other words, $h(V)$ is the height of the vector in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}^{\binom{N}{M}}$ whose entries are the determinants of all $M \times M$ minors of $\mathcal{A}$ with the Euclidean norm taken at the infinite places and maximum norm at the finite places.

By Fischer's Inequality, cf. Remarks and 2.8.9 and 2.9.8 [5], we find $h(V) \leq (M/2)\log S(\mathcal{A}) + Mh_p(\mathcal{A})$; here we used that each row of $\mathcal{A}$ contains at most $S(\mathcal{A})$ non-zero entries. □

Lemma 3. *Let $P \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ with $p = \deg_X P \geq 1$ and $q = \deg_Y P \geq 1$. Furthermore, let m and n be integers with $m \geq 2q+1$ and $n \geq p$. If $t = q(n+1) - mp \geq 1$, there exist $A, B \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ with $P \nmid A$,*

(9)
$$AY^m - B \in P \cdot \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y] \setminus \{0\}, \quad \deg_X A, \deg_X B \leq n, \quad \deg_Y A, \deg_Y B \leq q-1,$$

and

$$h_p(A,B) \leq \frac{m(n-p+1)}{t}\left(\log\left((p+1)(q+1)\right) + h_p(P)\right) + \frac{\log(2nq)}{2}. \tag{10}$$

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{Q} = \sum_{k,l} q_{kl} X^k Y^l \in \mathbb{Z}[X,Y,q_{kl}]$ with $\deg_X \mathfrak{Q} = n-p$, $\deg_Y \mathfrak{Q} = m-1$, and where the q_{kl} are treated as unknowns. We define linear forms $f_{ij} \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[q_{kj}]$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$, $0 \leq j \leq m+q-1$ by

$$P\mathfrak{Q} = \sum_{i,j} f_{ij} X^i Y^j.$$

Each non-zero coefficient of f_{ij} is a coefficient of P. So

$$f_{ij} = 0 \quad (0 \leq i \leq n, \quad q \leq j \leq m-1) \tag{11}$$

is a system of linear equations of a certain rank M in the $N = (n-p+1)m$ unknowns q_{kl}. We have

$$M \leq (n+1)(m-q) = N - t. \tag{12}$$

Because $N - M \geq t \geq 1$ there is a non-trivial solution. Any such solution gives rise to a non-zero polynomial $Q \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ such that the coefficients of PQ satisfy (11) and hence $PQ = AY^m - B$ for unique polynomials $A, B \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ with $\deg_X A, \deg_X B \leq n$ and $\deg_Y A, \deg_Y B \leq q-1$. The terms in AY^m and B do not overlap, hence $h_p(A,B) = h_p(PQ)$.

The final term in the upper bound (8) works against us if $N - M$ is large. We now work out a lower bound for M. A non-trivial $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-linear combination of $X^k Y^l P$ where $0 \leq k \leq n-p$ and $q \leq l \leq m-q-1$ is not of the form $AY^m - B$ with A and B satisfying the degree bounds in (9). Recall that $m \geq 2q+1$, so $M \geq (n-p+1)(m-2q) \geq n-p+1 \geq 1$ and hence

$$N - M \leq (n-p+1)(m-(m-2q)) \leq 2nq. \tag{13}$$

We will apply Siegel's Lemma to find a solution Q with small projective height. We choose a subset of the linear forms f_{ij} $(0 \leq i \leq n,\ q \leq j \leq m-1)$ with rank M and use the coefficients of each such linear form to define a row in an $M \times N$ matrix $\mathcal{A}$. The non-zero entries of $\mathcal{A}$ are coefficients of P, hence $h_p(\mathcal{A}) \leq h_p(P)$. Furthermore, by definition each f_{ij} involves at most $(p+1)(q+1)$ non-zero coefficients and hence

$S(\mathcal{A}) \leq (p+1)(q+1)$. By Lemma 2 and our discussion above there exists a non-zero solution $Q \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ of (11) that satisfies

$$h_p(Q) \leq \frac{M}{N-M}\left(\frac{1}{2}\log((p+1)(q+1)) + h_p(P)\right) + \frac{\log(N-M)}{2}. \tag{14}$$

Lemma 1(i) implies $h_p(PQ) \leq \log((p+1)(q+1)) + h_p(P) + h_p(Q)$. Furthermore, we use the inequalities (14), (12), and (13) to conclude that $h_p(PQ)$ is at most

$$\begin{aligned}
&\log((p+1)(q+1)) + h_p(P) + \frac{M}{t}\left(\log((p+1)(q+1)) + h_p(P)\right) + \frac{\log(2nq)}{2} \\
&= \frac{M+t}{t}\left(\log((p+1)(q+1)) + h_p(P)\right) + \frac{\log(2nq)}{2} \\
&\leq \frac{N}{t}\left(\log\left((p+1)(q+1)\right) + h_p(P)\right) + \frac{\log(2nq)}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This inequality completes the proof of (10) because $N = m(n-p+1)$.

Finally, we must verify $P \nmid A$. Indeed assuming the contrary, then P also divides B. Because $\deg_Y A, \deg_Y B \leq q-1$ we have $A = B = 0$, a contradiction to $AY^m - B \neq 0$. □

3. Multiplicity Estimates

We need some facts about function fields which we recall here for the reader's convenience. We refer to Chevalley's book [6] for proofs.

For a field F we write $F^\times = F \smallsetminus \{0\}$. Suppose F contains an algebraically closed subfield L and that there exists an element $t \in F$ that is transcendental over L such that F is a finite field extension of $L(t)$. Then F is a function field over L. We define M_F to be the set of the maximal ideals of all the proper valuation rings of F containing L. This set is the function field analogue of M_K for a number field K. Observe that its elements, the places of F, have degree 1 since L is algebraically closed. We will identify an element of M_F with the valuation function it induces. Hence an element of M_F is a surjective map $v : F \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that for all $a, b \in F$ we have $v(ab) = v(a) + v(b)$ and $v(a+b) \geq \min\{v(a), v(b)\}$, $v(a) = \infty$ if and only if $a = 0$, and $v(a) = 0$ if $a \in L^\times$; we use the convention $\infty + x = x + \infty = \infty$ and $\min\{\infty, x\} = \min\{x, \infty\} = x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$.

If $a \in F^\times$, then $v(a) = 0$ for all but finitely many $v \in M_F$ and

$$\sum_{v \in M_F} v(a) = 0.$$

Furthermore, if $a \in F \smallsetminus L$ then

$$\sum_{v \in M_F} \max\{0, v(a)\} = [F : L(a)].$$

Suppose $P \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ is irreducible and let F denote the field of fractions of the domain $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]/(P)$. Then F is a function field over $L = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. By abuse of notation we shall consider polynomials in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ as elements of F via the quotient map. Note that any polynomial in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ that is not divisible by P maps to $F^\times$.

Let $\pi = (x, y) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^2$ with $P(\pi) = 0$ such that $\frac{\partial P}{\partial X}, \frac{\partial P}{\partial Y}$ do not both vanish at π, then we call π a *regular zero* of P. Let us assume for the moment that $\frac{\partial P}{\partial Y}(\pi) \neq 0$, then there exists a unique $v_\pi \in M_F$ with $v_\pi(X - x) = 1$ and $v_\pi(Y - y) \geq 1$. Moreover, there exists E in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[[T]]$, the ring of formal power series with coefficients in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, such that $E(0) = 0$ and $P(x + T, y + E) = 0$. For any $A \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X, Y]$ not divisible by P we have

$$\operatorname{ord} A(x + T, y + E) = v_\pi(A)$$

where ord is the standard valuation on $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[[T]]$. Therefore $v_\pi(A) \geq 1$ if and only if $A(x, y) = 0$. If $\frac{\partial P}{\partial X}(\pi) \neq 0$ then these properties hold with the roles of X and Y reversed.

Let $A \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X, Y]$, we define

$$D(A) = \frac{\partial P}{\partial Y}\frac{\partial A}{\partial X} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial X}\frac{\partial A}{\partial Y} \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X, Y].$$

We also set $D^0(A) = A$ and inductively $D^s(A) = D(D^{s-1}(A))$ for all positive integers s. A formal verification yields $D(P) = 0$ and $D(AB) = D(A)B + AD(B)$ for all $B \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X, Y]$. Thus we have Leibniz's rule

$$D^s(AB) = \sum_{k=0}^{s} \binom{s}{k} D^k(A)D^{s-k}(B) \quad \text{and} \quad D^s(PA) = PD^s(A) \text{ if } s \geq 0. \tag{15}$$

Lemma 4. *Let K be a number field and $P \in K[X, Y]$ with $p = \deg_X P \geq 1$ and $q = \deg_Y P \geq 1$. Furthermore, assume $A \in K[X, Y]$ such that $\deg_X A \leq n$, $\deg_Y A \leq q - 1$. Then for any non-negative $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have*

$$\deg_X D^s(A) \leq n + (p - 1)s \quad \textit{and} \quad \deg_Y D^s(A) \leq (q - 1)(s + 1). \tag{16}$$

Moreover, if $r = \max\{p, q\}$ and $v \in M_K$ then

$$|D^s(A)|_v \leq \delta_v(2(p + 1)(q + 1)r(n + rs))^s |P|_v^s |A|_v. \tag{17}$$

Proof. We note $\deg_X D(A) \leq \deg_X(A) + p - 1$ and so the first inequality in (16) follows by induction on s. The second inequality is proved similarly.

We now show (17) by induction on s. The case $s = 0$ being trivial we may assume $s \geq 1$ and also $D^s(A) \neq 0$. For brevity set $|\cdot| = |\cdot|_v$. We apply Lemma 1(i) to deduce

$$|D^s(A)| \leq \delta_v(2(p + 1)(q + 1)) \max\left\{\left|\frac{\partial P}{\partial Y}\right|\left|\frac{\partial D^{s-1}(A)}{\partial X}\right|, \left|\frac{\partial P}{\partial X}\right|\left|\frac{\partial D^{s-1}(A)}{\partial Y}\right|\right\}.$$

By bounding the partial derivatives of the polynomials in the usual manner we get

$$|D^s(A)| \leq \delta_v(2(p + 1)(q + 1)r \max\{\deg_X D^{s-1}(A), \deg_Y D^{s-1}(A)\})|P||D^{s-1}(A)|.$$

The inequalities in (16) imply

$$|D^s(A)| \leq \delta_v(2(p + 1)(q + 1)r \max\{n + (p - 1)(s - 1), (q - 1)s\})|P||D^{s-1}(A)|.$$

The expressions inside the maximum are bounded from above by $n + rs$. Applying the induction hypothesis completes the proof. □

Lemma 5. *Suppose $P \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ is irreducible, let $\pi \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^2$ be a regular zero of P and let $v = v_\pi \in M_F$ be the valuation described above. If $A \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ is not divisible by P and $A(\pi) = 0$, then $D(A)$ is not divisible by P and*

$$v(D(A)) = v(A) - 1.$$

Proof. We assume $\frac{\partial P}{\partial Y}(\pi) \neq 0$, the case $\frac{\partial P}{\partial X}(\pi) \neq 0$ is similar. Say $\pi = (x,y)$. There exists $E \in T\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[[T]]$ such that $P(x+T, y+E) = 0$ and $v(A) = \operatorname{ord} A(x+T, y+E) \geq 1$. By the chain rule we have

$$0 = \frac{d}{dT} P(x+T, y+E) = \frac{\partial P}{\partial X}(x+T, y+E) + \frac{dE}{dT}\frac{\partial P}{\partial Y}(x+T, y+E).$$

We use this and the definition of D to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{ord} D(A)(x+T, y+E) \\
&= \operatorname{ord}\left(\left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial Y}\frac{\partial A}{\partial X} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial X}\frac{\partial A}{\partial Y}\right)(x+T, y+E)\right) \\
&= \operatorname{ord}\frac{\partial P}{\partial Y}(x+T, y+E) + \operatorname{ord}\left(\frac{\partial A}{\partial X}(x+T, y+E) + \frac{dE}{dT}\frac{\partial A}{\partial Y}(x+T, y+E)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

By our assumption we have $\operatorname{ord}\frac{\partial P}{\partial Y}(x+T, y+E) = 0$ which we insert into the equality above and use the chain rule again as well as $A(x,y) = 0$ to get

$$\operatorname{ord} D(A)(x+T, y+E) = \operatorname{ord}\frac{d}{dT} A(x+T, y+E) = \operatorname{ord} A(x+T, y+E) - 1.$$

Hence $v(D(A)) = v(A) - 1$. In particular, P does not divide $D(A)$. □

We now prove a multiplicity estimate which will be useful later on.

Lemma 6. *Let A, B, P, m, p, q, and t be as in Lemma 3 with $t \geq 1$. Furthermore, assume P is irreducible and $\deg P = p + q$. If $\pi \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^2$ is a regular zero of P, there exists an integer s with $0 \leq s \leq t + pq - p - q$ such that $D^s(A)(\pi) \neq 0$ and $D^k(A)(\pi) = 0$ for all $0 \leq k < s$.*

Proof. Let F be as above Lemma 4. For brevity set $v = v_\pi$. Clearly $X, Y \in F \smallsetminus \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ since p and q are both positive; also $v(X), v(Y) \geq 0$. Furthermore, $A \neq 0$ in F by Lemma 3.

We first claim that for any $v' \in M_F$ at least one of the two $v'(X), v'(Y)$ is non-negative. Indeed we argue by contradiction so let us assume $v'(X) < 0$ and $v'(Y) < 0$. Then for any integers i, j with $0 \leq i \leq p$, $0 \leq j \leq q$ and $i + j < p + q$ we have

$$iv'(X) + jv'(Y) > pv'(X) + qv'(Y). \tag{18}$$

Now by hypothesis $P = \alpha X^p Y^q + \tilde{P}$ with $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\deg \tilde{P} < p + q$. We apply the ultrametric inequality and (18) to get

$$pv'(X) + qv'(Y) \geq \min_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq p, 0 \leq j \leq q \\ i+j<p+q}} \{iv'(X) + jv'(Y)\} > pv'(X) + qv'(Y),$$

a contradiction.

Now assume $v' \in M_F$ such that $v'(Y) < 0$. Then $v'(X) \geq 0$ by the discussion above and

$$v'(A) = v'(BY^{-m}) = v'(B) - mv'(Y). \tag{19}$$

Now $\deg_Y B \leq q-1$ so the ultrametric inequality implies $v'(B) \geq (q-1)v'(Y)$. We insert this last inequality into (19) to find

$$v'(A) \geq (q-1-m)v'(Y) \geq -v'(Y) > 0 \tag{20}$$

because $q \leq m$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{v' \in M_F} \max\{0, v'(A)\} &\geq \max\{0, v(A)\} + \sum_{\substack{v' \in M_F \\ v'(Y)<0}} \max\{0, v'(A)\} \\ &\geq v(A) + (m+1-q) \sum_{\substack{v' \in M_F \\ v'(Y)<0}} \max\{0, -v'(Y)\} \qquad (21)\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (20). Next we insert the equality

$$\sum_{\substack{v' \in M_F \\ v'(Y)<0}} \max\{0, v'(Y^{-1})\} = [F : \overline{\mathbb{Q}}(Y^{-1})] = [F : \overline{\mathbb{Q}}(Y)] = p$$

into (21) to find

$$\sum_{v' \in M_F} \max\{0, v'(A)\} \geq v(A) + (m+1-q)p > 0. \tag{22}$$

In particular $A \notin \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$.

We continue by bounding the left-hand side of (22) from above. If $v' \in M_F$ with $v'(X) \geq 0$ and $v'(Y) \geq 0$ then $v'(A) \geq 0$ because A is a polynomial in X and Y. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{v' \in M_F} \max\{0, -v'(A)\} \leq &\sum_{v' \in M_F, v'(X)<0} \max\{0, -v'(A)\} + \\ &\sum_{v' \in M_F, v'(Y)<0} \max\{0, -v'(A)\}. \qquad (23)\end{aligned}$$

Actually equality holds above because at most one $v'(X)$, $v'(Y)$ can be negative, but this is not important here. Around (20) we showed that if $v'(Y) < 0$ then $v'(A) > 0$, hence the second term on the right-hand side of (23) is zero. Now recall that $\deg_X A \leq n$; if $v'(X) < 0$ then $v'(Y) \geq 0$ and the ultrametric inequality leads us to $v'(A) \geq nv'(X)$. If we insert this inequality into (23) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{v' \in M_F} \max\{0, -v'(A)\} &\leq n \sum_{v' \in M_F, v'(X)<0} \max\{0, -v'(X)\} \qquad (24) \\ &= n[F : \overline{\mathbb{Q}}(X^{-1})] = n[F : \overline{\mathbb{Q}}(X)] = nq.\end{aligned}$$

The left-hand sides of (22) and (24) are both equal to $[F : \overline{\mathbb{Q}}(A)]$, so we get

$$v(A) \leq nq + (q-m-1)p = t + pq - p - q.$$

If we set $s = v(A)$, then Lemma 5 and induction give $v(D^k(A)) = v(A) - k$ for $0 \le k \le s$. Hence $D^s(A)(\pi) \neq 0$ and $D^k(A)(\pi) = 0$ for $0 \le k < s$. □

4. Completion of Proof

Lemma 7. *Say $\kappa > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ are real numbers with $\kappa\lambda \ge 2$. Let $P \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X, Y]$ be irreducible with $p = \deg_X P \ge 1$, $q = \deg_Y P \ge 1$, and $\deg P = p + q$. For a regular zero $(x, y) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^2$ of P we define*

$$k = \max\left\{\frac{h(x)}{q}, \frac{h(y)}{p}\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad h = \log\left((p+1)(q+1)\right) + h_p(P). \tag{25}$$

If $k \ge \lambda^2 h$, then

$$\begin{aligned} h(y) \le & \frac{p}{q}h(x) + p\left(\kappa + \frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{4}{\kappa}\right)(hk)^{1/2} \\ & + \frac{1}{\kappa\lambda}\left(\frac{\log(16\kappa\lambda)}{8} + \frac{\log 3}{24} + 9\log(p+1) + \log\left(1 + \frac{\kappa\lambda}{2}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We first handle the case $q = 1$ using Lemma 1(iii). Indeed, as P is irreducible, it cannot be divisible by a polynomial that is linear in X. As $h \ge h_p(P)$ and $h \ge \log(p+1)$, we find

$$h(y) \le ph(x) + \log(p+1) + h_p(P) \le ph(x) + h \le ph(x) + \lambda^{-1}(hk)^{1/2} \tag{26}$$

where we also used $h \le \lambda^{-2}k$. Observe that $\lambda^{-1} \le p\kappa$ because $\kappa\lambda \ge 1$. The bound (26) is better than our claim. Hence we now assume $q \ge 2$.

As $h > 0$ we may define

$$m = q\left\lceil \kappa pq\left(\frac{k}{h}\right)^{1/2}\right\rceil \quad \text{and} \quad n = m\frac{p}{q} + p - 1 \tag{27}$$

where $\lceil z \rceil$ is the least integer greater or equal to $z \in \mathbb{R}$. So m and n are integers and

$$m \ge \kappa pq^2\left(\frac{k}{h}\right)^{1/2} \ge \kappa\lambda pq^2 \tag{28}$$

and

$$m \le q\left(\kappa pq\left(\frac{k}{h}\right)^{1/2} + 1\right) = \kappa pq^2\left(\frac{k}{h}\right)^{1/2} + q. \tag{29}$$

The lower bound for m implies $m > 2q$ as $\kappa\lambda > 1$ by hypothesis and since $q \ge 2$. Therefore, $m \ge 2q + 1$ and $n \ge p$.

Let $t = q(n+1) - mp$ be as in Lemma 3, then $t = pq \ge 1$. So the said lemma provides $A, B \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X, Y]$ as therein. Because of Lemma 6 there exists an integer s with

$$0 \le s \le t + pq - p - q \le 2pq - 1$$

such that $D^s(A)(x, y) \neq 0$ and $D^k(A)(x, y) = 0$ for all $0 \le k < s$. We apply Leibniz's rule (15) to $D^s(AY^m - B)$ and the use the fact that $AY^m - B$ is divisible by P to

conclude

$$y^m = \frac{D^s(B)(x,y)}{D^s(A)(x,y)}.$$

Lemma 1(ii) and $h(y^m) = mh(y)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} mh(y) \le{}& h_p(D^s(A), D^s(B)) + \max\{\deg_X D^s(A), \deg_X D^s(B)\}h(x) \\ &+ \max\{\deg_Y D^s(A), \deg_Y D^s(B)\}h(y) \\ &+ \log\max\{(\deg_X D^s(A)+1)(\deg_Y D^s(A)+1), \\ &\qquad (\deg_X D^s(B)+1)(\deg_Y D^s(B)+1)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

We use Lemma 4 applied to A and B to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\deg_X D^s(A), \deg_X D^s(B)\} &\le n + (p-1)s, \\ \max\{\deg_Y D^s(A), \deg_Y D^s(B)\} &\le (q-1)(s+1) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$h_p(D^s(A), D^s(B)) \le h_p(A,B) + sh_p(P) + s\log\big(2(p+1)(q+1)r(n+rs)\big)$$

with $r = \max\{p,q\}$; the last line follows from summing up the local bounds in (17). We insert these bounds in (30) to see

$$\begin{aligned} mh(y) \le{}& h_p(A,B) + sh_p(P) + (n+(p-1)s)h(x) + (q-1)(s+1)h(y) \\ &+ s\log\big(2(p+1)(q+1)r(n+rs)\big) + \log\big((1+n+(p-1)s)q(s+1)\big). \end{aligned}$$

Next we use the bound given for $h_p(A,B)$ in Lemma 3 and recall $t = pq$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} mh(y) \le{}& \frac{m(n-p+1)}{pq}\left(\log\left((p+1)(q+1)\right) + h_p(P)\right) + \frac{\log(2nq)}{2} \\ &+ sh_p(P) + (n+(p-1)s)h(x) + (q-1)(s+1)h(y) \\ &+ s\log\big(2(p+1)(q+1)r(n+rs)\big) + \log\big((1+n+(p-1)s)q(s+1)\big). \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

We use $n \le mp/q + p$, which follows from (27), and find

$$\begin{aligned} &(n+(p-1)s)h(x) + (q-1)(s+1)h(y) \\ &\qquad \le m\frac{p}{q}h(x) + (p+(p-1)s)qk + (q-1)(s+1)pk \\ &\qquad \le m\frac{p}{q}h(x) + \big(pq + (p-1)sq + (q-1)(s+1)p\big)k \\ &\qquad \le m\frac{p}{q}h(x) + 4p^2q^2k \end{aligned}$$

using the definition of k and since $s \le 2pq-1$. We insert this bound into (31), divide by m, and use the definition of h to get

$$\begin{aligned} h(y) \le{}& \frac{p}{q}h(x) + \left(\frac{n-p+1}{pq} + \frac{s}{m}\right)h + \frac{4p^2q^2}{m}k + \frac{\log(2nq)}{2m} \\ &+ \frac{2pq-1}{m}\log\big(2(p+1)(q+1)r(n+rs)\big) + \frac{1}{m}\log\big((1+n+(p-1)s)q(s+1)\big) \end{aligned}$$

Suppose for the moment $s \geq 1$, then $1+n+(p-1)s \leq n+rs$. We also have $q(s+1) \leq 2pq^2 \leq 2(p+1)(q+1)r$. Therefore, $(1+n+(p-1)s)q(s+1) \leq 2(p+1)(q+1)r(n+rs)$ and this inequality also holds for $s=0$ as $n \geq 1$. We find

$$\begin{aligned} h(y) \leq \frac{p}{q}h(x) + \left(\frac{n-p+1}{pq} + \frac{s}{m}\right)h + \frac{4p^2q^2}{m}k + \frac{\log(2nq)}{2m} \\ + \frac{2pq}{m}\log\big(2(p+1)(q+1)r(n+rs)\big) \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

We now continue by bounding each term on the right-hand side of inequality (32). The first term $\frac{p}{q}h(x)$ is the main contribution to $h(y)$.

To bound the second term we recall our choice (27) which yields $(n-p+1)/(pq) = m/q^2$. Observe that

$$\frac{n-p+1}{pq} + \frac{s}{m} \leq \frac{m}{q^2} + \frac{2}{\kappa\lambda q} \leq \frac{m}{q^2} + \frac{1}{q}$$

by (28), $s \leq 2pq$, and $\kappa\lambda \geq 2$. So the second term on the right of (32) satisfies

$$\left(\frac{n-p+1}{pq} + \frac{s}{m}\right)h \leq \left(\frac{m}{q^2} + \frac{1}{q}\right)h \leq \left(\kappa p\left(\frac{k}{h}\right)^{1/2} + \frac{2}{q}\right)h \leq \kappa p(kh)^{1/2} + h$$

because of (29) and $q \geq 2$. Using $h \leq \lambda^{-2}k$ we find

$$\left(\frac{n-p+1}{pq} + \frac{s}{m}\right)h \leq p\left(\kappa + \frac{1}{p\lambda}\right)(kh)^{1/2} \leq p\left(\kappa + \frac{1}{\lambda}\right)(kh)^{1/2}. \tag{33}$$

The third term in (32) can be bounded from above using the first inequality in (28) as follows

$$\frac{4p^2q^2}{m}k \leq \frac{4p}{\kappa}(hk)^{1/2}. \tag{34}$$

We move on to the fourth term and recall $n \leq mp/q + p$. As $m \geq \kappa\lambda pq^2 \geq 4\kappa\lambda p \geq 4\kappa\lambda, m \geq q$, since $z \mapsto z^{-1}\log(4z)$ is decreasing on $[1,\infty)$, and because $p^{-1}\log p \leq (\log 3)/3$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log(2nq)}{2m} \leq \frac{\log(2mp+2pq)}{2m} \leq \frac{\log(4mp)}{2m} \leq \frac{\log(16\kappa\lambda)}{8\kappa\lambda} + \frac{\log p}{8\kappa\lambda p} \\ \leq \frac{\log(16\kappa\lambda)}{8\kappa\lambda} + \frac{\log 3}{24\kappa\lambda}. \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

For the fifth term we use $n \leq mp/q + p, s \leq 2pq-1$, and $q \geq 2$ to bound

$$n + rs \leq m\frac{p}{q} + p + r(2pq-1) \leq m\frac{p}{2} + 2pqr \leq 2pqr\left(1 + \frac{m}{4pq}\right)$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2pq}{m}\log(n+rs) &\leq \frac{2\log(2pqr)}{\kappa\lambda q} + \frac{2pq}{m}\log\left(1 + \frac{m}{4pq}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{2\log(2pqr)}{\kappa\lambda q} + \frac{1}{\kappa\lambda}\log\left(1 + \frac{\kappa\lambda}{2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

as $m/(pq) \geq \kappa\lambda q \geq 2\kappa\lambda$ and since $z \mapsto z^{-1}\log(1+z/2)$ is decreasing on $(0,\infty)$. We deduce

$$\frac{2pq}{m}\log(2(p+1)(q+1)r(n+rs)) \leq \frac{2}{\kappa\lambda}\Big(\frac{\log(2(p+1)r)}{q} + \frac{\log(q+1)}{q} + \frac{\log(2pqr)}{q} + \frac{1}{2}\log\Big(1+\frac{\kappa\lambda}{2}\Big)\Big). \tag{36}$$

Below we will use the estimates $q^{-1}\log(q+1) \leq (\log 3)/2$ and $q^{-1}\log(2q) \leq \log 2$, which hold since $q \geq 2$.

If $q > p$, then $r = q$ and so $q^{-1}\log(2(p+1)r) \leq 0.5\log(p+1) + \log 2$. We have $q^{-1}\log(2q^2) \leq \log\sqrt{8}$. Hence the right-hand side of (36) is at most

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{2}{\kappa\lambda}\left(\log(p+1) + \log 2 + \frac{1}{2}\log 3 + \log\sqrt{8} + \frac{1}{2}\log\left(1+\frac{\kappa\lambda}{2}\right)\right)\\ &\leq \frac{1}{\kappa\lambda}\left(9\log(p+1) + \log\left(1+\frac{\kappa\lambda}{2}\right)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Now suppose $p \geq q$, then $r = p \geq 2$. We bound $0.5\log(2(p+1)p) \leq 0.5\log(2) + \log(p+1) \leq 1.5\log(p+1)$, $q^{-1}\log(q+1) \leq 0.5\log(p+1)$, and $q^{-1}\log(2pqr) \leq 0.5\log(p^2) + \log 2 \leq 2\log(p+1)$. In this case, the right-hand side of (36) is at most

$$\frac{2}{\kappa\lambda}\left(4\log(p+1) + \frac{1}{2}\log\left(1+\frac{\kappa\lambda}{2}\right)\right) = \frac{1}{\kappa\lambda}\left(8\log(p+1) + \log\left(1+\frac{\kappa\lambda}{2}\right)\right).$$

In both cases we find that the fifth term is bounded by (37). We insert this upper bound as well as (33), (34), (35) into (32) to find

$$\begin{aligned}h(y) \leq \frac{p}{q}h(x) + p\left(\kappa + \frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{4}{\kappa}\right)(kh)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{8\kappa\lambda}\left(\log(16\kappa\lambda) + \frac{\log 3}{3}\right)\\ + \frac{1}{\kappa\lambda}\left(9\log(p+1) + \log\left(1+\frac{\kappa\lambda}{2}\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

as required. □

Lemma 8. *Let $P \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ be irreducible with $p = \deg_X P \geq 1$ and $q = \deg_Y P \geq 1$. If $(x,y) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^2$ with $P(x,y) = 0$ is not a regular zero of P then*

$$\max\left\{\frac{h(x)}{q}, \frac{h(y)}{p}\right\} \leq 2h_p(P) + 4\log((p+1)(q+1)). \tag{38}$$

Proof. By symmetry we may assume $h(y)/p \geq h(x)/q$. Let $D \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[Y]$ be the resultant of the two polynomials $P, \partial P/\partial X \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}(Y)[X]$ (cf. Chapter IV, §8 [10]). Then $D \neq 0$ because P is irreducible in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}(Y)[X]$. The resultant D is the determinant of a $(2p-1)\times(2p-1)$ matrix whose entries, denoted here by m_{ij}, are polynomials in Y with degrees bounded by q. We find $\deg D \leq (2p-1)q \leq 2pq$ and, using the structure of the resultant matrix, that D is a sum of at most $(p+1)^{p-1}p^p \leq (p+1)^{2p-1}$ products of the m_{ij}. If K is a number field containing the coefficients of the m_{ij} and $v \in M_K$, then by Lemma 1(i) we find

$$|D|_v \leq \delta_v((p+1)^{2p-1}) \max_\sigma\{|m_{1,\sigma(1)}\cdots m_{2p-1,\sigma(2p-1)}|_v\} \tag{39}$$

where σ runs over all permutations of the first $2p-1$ positive integers. The second bound of Lemma 1(i) applied to the univariate m_{ij} yields

$$|m_{1,\sigma(1)}\cdots m_{2p-1,\sigma(2p-1)}|_v \le \delta_v((q+1)^{2p-2})|m_{1,\sigma}|_v\cdots|m_{2p-1,\sigma(2p-1)}|_v.$$

This inequality and $|m_{ij}|_v \le \delta_v(p)|P|_v$ inserted into (39) gives

$$|D|_v \le \delta_v((p+1)^{2p-1}(q+1)^{2p-2}p^{2p-1})|P|_v^{2p-1} \le \delta_v((p+1)^{4p}(q+1)^{2p})|P|_v^{2p-1}.$$

We take the sum over all places of K to find $h_p(D) \le 2ph_p(P) + 4p\log(p+1) + 2p\log(q+1)$.

Now if $(x,y) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^2$ with $P(x,y)=0$ is not a regular zero of P, then $D(y)=0$. By Lemma 1(iii) we can bound $h(y) \le h_p(D) + \log\deg D \le h_p(D) + \log(2pq)$. The bound (38) follows from this inequality together with the bound for $h_p(D)$ and since $p^{-1}\log(2pq) \le \log(2q) \le 2\log(q+1)$. □

Lemma 9. *Say $\kappa > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ are real numbers with $\kappa\lambda \ge 4$. Let $P \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ be irreducible with $p = \deg_X P \ge 1$, $q = \deg_Y P \ge 1$, and $\deg P = p+q$. For $(x,y) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^2$ with $P(x,y)=0$ we define k and h as in (25). If $k \ge \lambda^2 h$, then*

$$\left|\frac{h(x)}{q} - \frac{h(y)}{p}\right| \le \left(\kappa + \frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{4}{\kappa}\right)(hk)^{1/2} + \frac{9}{8\kappa\lambda}\log(363\kappa\lambda). \tag{40}$$

Proof. By symmetry we may suppose $h(y)/p \ge h(x)/q$. Let us assume that (x,y) is a regular zero of P. We divide the bound in Lemma 7 by p, use $p^{-1}\log(p+1) \le \log 2$, $1 + \kappa\lambda/2 \le \kappa\lambda$, and

$$\frac{\log(16\kappa\lambda)}{8p} + \frac{\log 3}{24p} + 9\log 2 + \frac{\log(\kappa\lambda)}{p} \le \frac{9}{8}\log\left(2^{76/9}3^{1/27}\kappa\lambda\right) \le \frac{9}{8}\log\left(363\kappa\lambda\right)$$

to conclude (40).

The upper bound given by Lemma 8 is at most $4h \le 4\lambda^{-1}(hk)^{1/2}$. If (x,y) is not a regular zero. This is also an upper bound for $|h(x)/q - h(y)/p|$ so the current lemma follows as $4\lambda^{-1} \le \kappa$. □

Lemma 10. *Let $P \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ be irreducible with $p = \deg_X P \ge 1$ and $q = \deg_Y P$. Then there is a root of unity ξ such that the polynomial $\tilde{P} = X^p P(X^{-1}+\xi, Y)$ has total degree $p+q$, is irreducible in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$, and satisfies*

$$\deg_X \tilde{P} = p, \quad \deg_Y \tilde{P} = q, \quad h_p(\tilde{P}) \le p\log 2 + h_p(P).$$

Proof. We may write $P = \sum_j a_j Y^j$ with $a_j = \sum_i a_{ij}X^i \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X]$. By hypothesis we have $a_q \ne 0$ and a_q has degree at most p as a polynomial in X. We choose a root of unity ξ such that $a_q(\xi) \ne 0$. A direct computation using the irreducibility of P shows that $\tilde{P}$ is irreducible. By construction $\deg_X \tilde{P} \le p$, $\deg_Y \tilde{P} \le q$ and therefore $\deg \tilde{P} \le p+q$.

Say $0 \le i \le p$ and $0 \le j \le q$, then the coefficient of X^iY^j in $\tilde{P}$ equals

$$\sum_{k=p-i}^{p} a_{kj}\binom{k}{p-i}\xi^{i-p+k}. \tag{41}$$

So if $i = p$ and $j = q$ we see that the coefficient of X^pY^q is $a_q(\xi) \neq 0$ and conclude that $\deg_X \tilde{P} = p$, $\deg_Y \tilde{P} = q$, and $\deg \tilde{P} = p + q$.

Now say K is a number field that contains ξ and all coefficients of P. If $v \in M_K$, then by (41) and standard facts on binomial coefficients we get

$$\begin{aligned}|\tilde{P}|_v &\leq \max_{0\leq i\leq p} \delta_v \left(\sum_{k=p-i}^{p} \binom{k}{p-i} \right) |P|_v = \max_{0\leq i\leq p} \delta_v \left(\binom{p+1}{p-i+1} \right) |P|_v \\ &\leq \delta_v(2^p)|P|_v.\end{aligned}$$

We sum over the locals bounds to complete the proof. □

of Theorem 1. By symmetry, we may suppose $p = \deg_X P \leq \deg_Y P = q$.

First suppose $q = 1$. Then $p = 1$. Clearly, $|h(x) - h(y)| \leq \max\{h(x), h(y)\}$ and Lemma 1(iii) implies $|h(x) - h(y)| \leq \log(2) + h_p(P)$. So $|h(x) - h(y)|$ is bounded from above by the geometric mean

$$(\log(2) + h_p(P))^{1/2} \max\{h(x), h(y)\}^{1/2}$$

which is less than the bound in the assertion.

So we may assume $q \geq 2$, in particular $(p + 1)(q + 1) \geq 6$. We make the choice $\kappa = 2.25$ and $\lambda = 4.98$. Let $k = \max\{h(x)/q, h(y)/p\}$.

We let ξ and $\tilde{P}$ be as in Lemma 10.

Say (x, y) is as in the hypothesis. If $x = \xi$, then $h(x) = 0$ and $h(y) \leq \log((p+1)q) + h_p(P)$ by Lemma 1(iii). Thus

$$\left| \frac{h(x)}{q} - \frac{h(y)}{p} \right| = \frac{h(y)}{p} \leq \left(\log((p + 1)q) + h_p(P) \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{h(y)}{p} \right)^{1/2}.$$

This is better than our claim.

We now assume $x \neq \xi$ and define $\tilde{x} = (x-\xi)^{-1}$. Hence $\tilde{P}(\tilde{x}, y) = 0$. By basic height properties, cf. Lemma 1.5.18 and Proposition 1.5.15 [5], we find $h(\tilde{x}) = h(x - \xi)$ and $|h(\tilde{x}) - h(x)| \leq \log 2$. Thus

$$\left| \frac{h(x)}{q} - \frac{h(y)}{p} \right| \leq \left| \frac{h(\tilde{x})}{q} - \frac{h(y)}{p} \right| + \frac{\log 2}{q} \leq \left| \frac{h(\tilde{x})}{q} - \frac{h(y)}{p} \right| + \frac{\log 2}{2}. \tag{42}$$

First, we suppose $k - (\log 2)/q \geq \lambda^2\tilde{h}$ with $\tilde{h} = \log\left((p + 1)(q + 1)\right) + h_p(\tilde{P})$. Then $\max\{h(\tilde{x})/q, h(y)/p\} \geq \lambda^2\tilde{h}$. Lemma 9 applied to $\tilde{P}$ and (42) imply

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \frac{h(x)}{q} - \frac{h(y)}{p} \right| &\leq \left(\kappa + \frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{4}{\kappa} \right) (\tilde{h}\tilde{k})^{1/2} + \frac{9}{8\kappa\lambda} \log(363\kappa\lambda) + \frac{\log 2}{2} \\ &\leq 4.229(\tilde{h}\tilde{k})^{1/2} + 1.181\end{aligned}$$

with our choice of κ and λ and with $\tilde{k} = \max\{h(\tilde{x})/q, h(y)/p\}$. Now

$$\tilde{h} \leq \log\left((p + 1)(q + 1)\right) + p \log 2 + h_p(P) = \log\left(2^p(p + 1)(q + 1)\right) + h_p(P). \tag{43}$$

We have $k \geq \lambda^2\tilde{h} \geq \lambda^2 \log 6 > 1$ and therefore

$$\tilde{k} \leq k + \frac{\log 2}{q} \leq k + \frac{\log 2}{2} \leq k + \frac{\log 2}{2\lambda^2 \log 6} k \leq 1.008k.$$

We conclude $4.229(\tilde{h}\tilde{k})^{1/2}+1.181 \le 4.246(\log(2^p(p+1)(q+1))+h_p(P))^{1/2}k^{1/2}+1.181$. Observe that $\log(2^p(p+1)(q+1)) \ge \log 12$. The theorem follows in this case as $k \ge 1$ and $4.246 + 1.181(\log 12)^{-1/2} < 5$.

Second, we must treat the case $k - (\log 2)/q < \lambda^2\tilde{h}$. The bound (43) continues to hold and we find

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{h(x)}{q} - \frac{h(y)}{p}\right| &\le \max\left\{\frac{h(x)}{q}, \frac{h(y)}{p}\right\} = k \le \left(\frac{\log 2}{2} + \lambda^2\tilde{h}\right)^{1/2} k^{1/2} \\ &\le \left(\frac{\log 2}{2} + \lambda^2 \log(2^p(p+1)(q+1)) + \lambda^2 h_p(P)\right)^{1/2} k^{1/2} \\ &\le \left(\frac{\log 2}{2\log 12} + \lambda^2\right)^{1/2} (\log(2^p(p+1)(q+1)) + h_p(P))^{1/2}\, k^{1/2}\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\log(2^p(p+1)(q+1)) \ge \log 12$ again. This is better than our claim as $(\log(2)/(2\log 12) + \lambda^2)^{1/2} < 5$. □

Corollary 2 is easy to prove using Theorem 1. We set $k = \max\{h(x)/q, h(y)/p\}$. Say $P(x,y) = 0$ with $x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $h(y) > 2\frac{p}{q}h(x)$. Then

$$\frac{k}{2} \le \max\left\{\frac{h(x)}{q}, \frac{h(y)}{2p}\right\} = \frac{h(y)}{2p} < \frac{h(y)}{p} - \frac{h(x)}{q}.$$

By Theorem 1 we have

$$\frac{k}{2} < 5(\log(2^r(p+1)(q+1)) + h_p(P))^{1/2}k^{1/2}$$

and so

$$k^{1/2} < 10\,(\log(2^r(p+1)(q+1)) + h_p(P))^{1/2}.$$

This contradicts the bound in (2).

5. On a Theorem of Runge

In this section we will prove Theorem 3.

Let $P = \sum_{i,j} p_{ij}X^iY^j \in \mathbb{Z}[X,Y]$ be irreducible in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Y]$ with $d = \deg P = \deg_X P = \deg_Y P$. Furthermore, since Theorem 3 applies only to polynomials of degree at least 2, we assume $d \ge 2$. We use $P_d = \sum_{i+j=d} p_{ij}X^iY^j$ to denote the homogeneous part of degree d. Finally, we can factor P_d as $p_{d0}\prod_{s=1}^{d}(X - t_sY)$ with $t_s \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^\times$ for each $s \in \{1,\dots,d\}$.

Lemma 11. *Set $t = t_s$ for some $s \in \{1,\dots,d\}$. We have $h(t) \le h_p(P) + \log d$. Furthermore, if $R_t(X,Z) = P(X, t^{-1}(X-Z)) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X,Z]$, then $\deg_Z R = d$, $\deg_X R \le d-1$, and $h_p(R_t) \le d(\log(2d) + 2h_p(P))$.*

Proof. The bound for $h(t)$ follows from Lemma 1(iii); indeed t is a zero of $P_d(X,1) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[X]$ whose coefficients are coefficients of P.

Let $i, j \geq 0$ be integers, the coefficient of $X^i Z^j$ in R_t is

$$(-1)^j \sum_{k=0}^{d-j} \binom{j+k}{k} p_{i-k,j+k} t^{-j-k}.$$

Clearly, $\deg_Z R \leq d$. The coefficient of Z^d is nonzero and that of $X^i Z^j$ is zero provided $i \geq d$. The lemma now follows from local inequalities as in the proof of Lemma 10 together with basic height properties. □

If $P(x, y) = 0$ with x, y algebraic numbers, then $R_t(x, x - ty) = 0$.

Lemma 12. *Let $P(x, y) = 0$ with $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}$ and*

$$h(x) \geq 100d \left(\log \left((4d)^d d(d+1) \right) + 2dh_p(P) \right). \tag{44}$$

Set $t = t_s$ for some $s \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$, there exists an embedding $\sigma : \mathbb{Q}(t) \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\log \max\{1, |x - \sigma(t)y|\} \leq \frac{d-1}{d} h(x) + 10.4d(\log(2d) + h_p(P))^{1/2} h(x)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Let $R = R_t$ be as in Lemma 11, then R is irreducible. Now $\deg_X R \geq 1$, indeed if $\deg_X R = 0$, then by construction P has degree 1, which contradicts our assumption $d \geq 2$. Let $z = x - ty$, so $R(x, z) = 0$.

We recall that $\deg_X R \leq d - 1$ and $\deg_Z R = d$. So

$$\log(2^{\deg_X R}(\deg_X R + 1)(\deg_Z R + 1)) + h_p(R) \leq \log \left((4d)^d d(d+1) \right) + 2dh_p(P) \tag{45}$$

by Lemma 11. Our hypothesis (44) together with Corollary 2 yields $h(z) \leq 2(\deg_X R)h(x)/d$ and hence

$$\max \left\{ \frac{h(x)}{d}, \frac{h(z)}{\deg_X R} \right\} \leq 2 \frac{h(x)}{d}. \tag{46}$$

Next we apply Theorem 1 to R and use (46) as well as (45) to find

$$\frac{h(z)}{\deg_X R} \leq \frac{h(x)}{d} + \frac{5\sqrt{2}}{d^{1/2}} \left(\log \left((4d)^d d(d+1) \right) + 2dh_p(P) \right)^{1/2} h(x)^{1/2}.$$

We multiply with $\deg_X R \leq d - 1$ to obtain

$$h(z) \leq \frac{d-1}{d} h(x) + 10d \left(\frac{1}{2d} \log \left((4d)^d d(d+1) \right) + h_p(P) \right)^{1/2} h(x)^{1/2}.$$

As $d \geq 2$ we find $(2d)^{-1} \log \left((4d)^d d(d+1) \right) \leq 1.08 \log(2d)$ and this yields

$$h(z) \leq \frac{d-1}{d} h(x) + 10.4d \left(\log(2d) + h_p(P) \right)^{1/2} h(x)^{1/2}.$$

By the definition (3) of the height there exists an embedding $\sigma : \mathbb{Q}(t) \to \mathbb{C}$ with $\log \max\{1, |x - \sigma(t)y|\} \leq h(x - \sigma(t)y) = h(z)$. This concludes the proof. □

We now prove Theorem 3:

Let P be as in the hypothesis, so $d = \deg_X P \geq 2$ and there are non-conjugated zeros $t', t'' \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^\times$ of $P_d(X, 1)$. Suppose $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $P(x, y) = 0$. By symmetry we may assume $|y| \leq |x|$ and also $x \neq 0$.

To prove this theorem, we may assume $h(x) = \log|x| \geq 100d^4h$ with $h = \log(2d) + h_p(P)$. Using $d \geq 2$ we find

$$h \geq \frac{\log(4d)}{d^2} + \frac{\log(d(d+1))}{d^3} + \frac{2}{d^2}h_p(P)$$

and this implies

$$h(x) \geq 100d^4h \geq 100d\left(\log\left((4d)^d d(d+1)\right) + 2dh_p(P)\right),$$

the hypothesis of Lemma 12.

Let σ', σ'' be the embeddings given by Lemma 12 applied to t', t'' respectively, then $\sigma'(t') \neq \sigma''(t'')$. For brevity we define $\xi = x - \sigma'(t')y$ and $\eta = x - \sigma''(t'')y$; we eliminate y to get

$$x = \frac{\xi\sigma''(t'') - \eta\sigma'(t')}{\sigma''(t'') - \sigma'(t')}.$$

So

$$|x| \leq 2\max\{|\xi|, |\eta|\}\max\{|\sigma'(t')|, |\sigma''(t'')|\}|\sigma'(t') - \sigma''(t'')|^{-1} \tag{47}$$

for the complex absolute value $|\cdot|$.

We will bound $|\xi|$ and $|\eta|$ using Lemma 12, but first we bound the remaining absolute values in (47) using height inequalities. If $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, then $\log\max\{1, |\alpha|_v\} \leq [\mathbb{Q}(\alpha) : \mathbb{Q}]h(\alpha)$ for any $v \in M_{\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)}$. This inequality follows immediately from the definition of the height. Since for example $[\mathbb{Q}(t') : \mathbb{Q}] \leq d$ and $[\mathbb{Q}(t', t'') : \mathbb{Q}] \leq d^2$ we deduce from (47) that

$$\log|x| \leq \log 2 + d\max\{h(t'), h(t'')\} + d^2h(\sigma'(t') - \sigma''(t'')) + \log\max\{1, |\xi|, |\eta|\}. \tag{48}$$

Lemma 11 implies $\max\{h(t'), h(t'')\} \leq h_p(P) + \log d$. Next we use the bounds for $|\xi|$ and $|\eta|$ from Lemma 12. Together with (48) and standard height inequalities we have

$$\begin{aligned}\log|x| &\leq \log 2 + d(h_p(P) + \log d) + d^2(2h_p(P) + 2\log d + \log 2) \\ &\quad + \frac{d-1}{d}h(x) + 10.4dh^{1/2}h(x)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{d-1}{d}h(x) + 3d^2h + 10.4dh^{1/2}h(x)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

As $h(x) = \log|x|$ we find

$$\log|x| \leq 3d^3h + 10.4d^2h^{1/2}(\log|x|)^{1/2}.$$

If $B, C, T \geq 0$ with $T \leq C + B\sqrt{T}$, then

$$T \leq \frac{1}{4}\left(\left(B^2 + 4C\right)^{1/2} + B\right)^2.$$

We apply this inequality with $B = 10.4d^2h^{1/2}$, $C = 3d^3h$, and $T = \log|x|$ to conclude that

$$\log|x| \leq \frac{1}{4}\left(\left(10.4^2 + 12\right)^{1/2} d^2h^{1/2} + 10.4d^2h^{1/2}\right)^2 \leq 115d^4h.$$

The upper bound for $\log|y|$ in (3) follows since $|y| \leq |x|$.

References

1. M. Abouzaid, *Heights and logarithmic gcd on algebraic curves*, Int. J. Number Theory **4** (2008), no. 2, 177–197.
2. B. Bartolome, *The Skolem-Abouzaïd theorem in the singular case*, Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl. **26** (2015), no. 3, 263–289.
3. Y. F. Bilu and D. Masser, *A quick proof of Sprindzhuk's decomposition theorem*, More sets, graphs and numbers, Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud., vol. 15, Springer, Berlin, 2006, pp. 25–32.
4. E. Bombieri, *On Weil's "théorème de décomposition"*, Amer. J. Math. **105** (1983), no. 2, 295–308.
5. E. Bombieri and W. Gubler, *Heights in Diophantine Geometry*, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
6. C. Chevalley, *Introduction to the Theory of Algebraic Functions of One Variable*, Mathematical Surveys, No. VI, American Mathematical Society, New York, N. Y., 1951.
7. S. David and P. Philippon, *Minorations des hauteurs normalisées des sous-variétés des tores*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) **28** (1999), no. 3, 489–543.
8. D.L. Hilliker and E.G. Straus, *Determination of bounds for the solutions to those binary Diophantine equations that satisfy the hypotheses of Runge's theorem*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **280** (1983), no. 2, 637–657.
9. M. Hindry and J.H. Silverman, *Diophantine Geometry An Introduction*, Springer, 2000.
10. S. Lang, *Algebra*, third ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 211, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
11. A. Néron, *Quasi-fonctions et hauteurs sur les variétés abéliennes*, Ann. of Math. (2) **82** (1965), 249–331.
12. D. Roy and J.L. Thunder, *An absolute Siegel's lemma*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **476** (1996), 1–26.
13. ———, *Addendum and erratum to: "An absolute Siegel's lemma"*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **508** (1999), 47–51.
14. C. Runge, *Ueber ganzzahlige Lösungen von Gleichungen zwischen zwei Veränderlichen*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **100** (1887), 425–435.
15. P.G. Walsh, *A quantitative version of Runge's theorem on Diophantine equations*, Acta Arith. **62** (1992), no. 2, 157–172.
16. ———, *Corrections to: "A quantitative version of Runge's theorem on Diophantine equations"*, Acta Arith. **73** (1995), no. 4, 397–398.
17. S. Zhang, *Positive line bundles on arithmetic varieties*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **8** (1995), no. 1, 187–221.

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Basel, Spiegelgasse 1, 4051 Basel, Switzerland

E-mail address: philipp.habegger@unibas.ch